

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

RONNEL FITZGERALD,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 24-cv-1453-bhl

PAULA LAMPE, et al.,

Defendants.

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO STAY
AND MOTION TO AMEND THE COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff Ronnel Fitzgerald, who is representing himself, is proceeding on a First Amendment retaliation claim against Nurse Paula Lampe, Nurse Katie Patt, Sgt. Timothy Ryan, Health Services Manager (HSM) Sandra Sitzman, and Captain Nathan Haynes in connection with allegations that they fabricated a conduct report and found him guilty of it in retaliation for inmate complaints Fitzgerald filed in March 2022. Dkt. Nos. 12 & 18. Discovery closes February 20, 2026; and dispositive motions are due March 20, 2026. Dkt. No. 22.

On July 10, 2025, Fitzgerald filed a motion to stay the case and motion to amend the complaint. Dkt. No. 23. Fitzgerald explains that he “is not ready to proceed with the claims as they are” and he is in the process of drafting an amended complaint with the assistance of a jail house lawyer. *Id.* The Court will deny the motion. As explained in a prior order, Fitzgerald should focus on the claims that have been allowed to proceed rather than attempting to complicate the case with unnecessary (and improperly joined) claims and defendants. Dkt. No. 18. The reason the Court dismissed prior Defendants from the case is because Fitzgerald did not (and could not) state claims against them in this case. *See* Dkt. Nos. 12 & 18. Amendment of the complaint will

not help as he still cannot join unrelated claims against different Defendants in the same case. Fed. R. Civ. P. 18(a) and 20(a)(2); *George v. Smith*, 507 F.3d 605, 607 (7th Cir. 2007); *Wheeler v. Wexford Health Sources, Inc.*, 689 F.3d 680, 683 (7th Cir. 2012). If Fitzgerald believes that he is not “ready” to proceed with this case, he may voluntarily dismiss this case and refile a new case at a later time. But the Court will not stay this case or allow any further amendments of the complaint. The currently named Defendants are entitled to timely resolution of the claims against them and will be unfairly prejudiced with additional litigation delay. *See Runnion ex rel. Runnion v. Girl Scouts of Greater Chicago & Nw. Indiana*, 786 F.3d 510, 520 (7th Cir. 2015) (noting that the Court can deny a motion to amend the complaint based on futility, undue delay, undue prejudice, or bad faith.)

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Fitzgerald’s motion to stay and motion to amend the complaint (Dkt. No. 23) is **DENIED**.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin on July 11, 2025.

s/ Brett H. Ludwig

BRETT H. LUDWIG

United States District Judge